

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

3
4 **Wednesday, September 17, 2008**

5 **7:00 p.m.**

6 **Cottonwood Heights City Council Room**
7 **1265 East Fort Union Boulevard, Suite 300**
8 **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**
9

10 ***ATTENDANCE***

11
12 **Planning Commission Members:**

13
14 Gordon Nicholl, Chairman
15 Geoff Armstrong
16 Perry Bolyard
17 JoAnn Frost
18 Doug Haymore
19 Jim Keane
20 Amy Rosevear
21

City Staff:

Michael Black, Planning Director
Greg Platt, Planner
Brad Gilson, City Engineer

22 **BUSINESS MEETING**

23
24 **1. WELCOME/ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.**

25
26 Chairman Gordon Nicholl called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Procedural issues were
27 reviewed.
28

29 **2. CITIZEN COMMENTS.**

30
31 There were no citizen comments.
32

33 **3. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

34
35 **3.1 The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing and receive comments on the**
36 **proposed amendments to the Mixed-Use Zone (19.36) for the addition and**
37 **regulation of urban mixed-use self-storage facilities as request by Jim Kane.**
38

39 (19:01:33) Planning Director, Michael Black, presented the staff report and explained that what
40 is proposed is an applicant-initiated text amendment that would add mixed-use self-storage
41 facilities to the Mixed-Use Zone and incorporate regulations for the use. These regulations
42 would set forth how the building would function as a mixed-use building, how it will look, and
43 how it will interact with buildings in the neighborhood. The question to be considered is
44 whether this use can be adequately regulated and whether it should be allowed.
45

1 (19:02:59) The applicant, Jim Kane, stated that his primary residence is Atlanta, Georgia, but he
2 also owns a house in the area. He introduced his business partners, Mike Rowe and Dan Nixon.

3
4 Mr. Kane described the uses of the product and how they have changed over the course of the
5 years that that self-storage has been in existence. He also discussed how that has affected the
6 product itself and why they feel it fits well in the Mixed Use Zone in Cottonwood Heights. They
7 believe it will enhance and benefit other businesses and residents in the City. It will also
8 contribute to the gateway area where it is being considered. Potential uses for self-storage
9 facilities have historically been off-site file storage for businesses or as extra storage for retail or
10 commercial users for supplies or seasonal items. It might also be used by seasonal businesses.
11 He explained that residential use has become a more permanent function, as facilities become
12 more conveniently located and many times storage sheds are prohibited. A hobbyist might also
13 use the facility for additional storage. Mr. Kane explained that the depth of the market has
14 changed dramatically over the years. The need has changed from an occasional use to a more
15 consistent and permanent use for many people. Location has become more pertinent. The
16 customer base has decreased from a five- to seven-mile radius to less than three miles. Because
17 customers are storing more valuable belongings, close proximity has become important to them.

18
19 (19:07:41) Mr. Kane presented the proposed concept, which was proposed to the Architectural
20 Review Committee. He explained that the street frontage elevation has retail/office space across
21 the bottom floor. The storage office is located nearby, which Mr. Kane stated will sell packing
22 materials. The rear elevation features windows, due to ordinance requirements.

23
24 He showed various examples of urban self-storage units. The Seattle, Washington, facility is
25 designed to look like an apartment building. Another facility resembled an office building. He
26 clarified that these are not mixed-use developments, but designed to appear as such. He showed
27 several examples of facilities in various cities. The Orlando, Florida, facility for example, is a
28 true mixed-use building and used as a model to craft the proposed ordinance. Mr. Kane
29 explained that although all buildings appear different, the interiors are the same and the product
30 can be used in any environment. The greater the density of an area, the more uses there are for
31 such a facility. The product complements existing businesses because it affords an opportunity
32 for storage without the high cost of extra retail space. It also benefits residential users who may
33 have decreasing storage space.

34
35 (19:10:46) Mr. Kane showed an example of a storage office within a retail-oriented facility. The
36 office was presented as an inviting facility with helpful staff. Security measures in the building
37 include touch-pads for entrance into some hallways and elevators. Cameras record all persons
38 entering the site and continuously record digitally. Personnel are on-site to ensure locks are
39 secure and to monitor activity. The customer base is approximately half commercial and half
40 residential, with the residential users split between single-family homes and
41 apartment/condominium dwellers. The business office also accepts UPS and other package
42 service delivery for its clients. All spaces are climate controlled. The typical space features a
43 covered loading area with an automatic door. Some of their buildings feature a driveway
44 through the building for internal access. Many features are unique to urban center development
45 and were not offered in the past. The buildings are typically located on smaller parcels of land,

1 and, therefore, have increased in size vertically and become multi-story. Hallways are secure
2 and comfortable. There are call boxes conveniently located for assistance.

3
4 (19:15:01) Users demand that the product be closer to their locations. Mr. Kane explained that
5 this would assist the City by providing a service for existing businesses and provide a transition
6 zone between residential areas and busy streets. The facilities will provide a good revenue base
7 for property taxes without excessively taxing the City systems or increasing traffic.

8
9 Chair Nicholl opened the public hearing.

10
11 (19:16:14) Dick Jensen gave his address as 2086 LaCresta Drive. He asked where the proposed
12 self-storage facility would be located. Mr. Black explained that there currently is no proposed
13 exact location. The applicants requested that the use be added to the allowed uses in the Mixed-
14 Use Zone for future development. He explained that mixed-use properties are generally located
15 on Fort Union Boulevard and busier streets such as Highland Drive and 1300 East.

16
17 (19:17:01) Michelle Widener stated that the need for surveillance indicates that the business will
18 attract unsavory people to the neighborhood. She reported that there have already been four cars
19 stolen from her front yard. She did not want such a business in her neighborhood. Chair Nicholl
20 clarified that these types of facilities would not be located in a residential neighborhood. They
21 could potentially be located in the Mixed-Use Zone, which is more commercialized zoning than
22 residential neighborhood. Ms. Widener thought the use would attract more crime to the area.
23 Chair Nicholl commented that the security is for the facility itself. Mr. Black agreed and added
24 that most facilities now have security, even uses such as animal hospitals. He remarked that this
25 is part of the nature of any building. Commissioner Armstrong added that many residences now
26 have security as well.

27
28 (19:18:27) Danette Kennelly, a Greendale Road resident, was worried that the next step will be
29 to change a residential neighborhood to a mixed-use zoning. She thought it was misleading to
30 represent that the proposed business would not be in a residential neighborhood when the
31 possibility exists for such a zoning change. She suggested the mixed-use issue be addressed
32 before a decision is made on this item.

33
34 (19:19:14) Eric Felt gave his address as 7956 Willow Circle. He commented that the
35 development as presented is nice and not a typical self-storage facility. He inquired as to
36 whether the zoning change will open the use to all self-storage facilities or just this particular
37 type. Chair Nicholl explained that only the proposed format would be allowed.

38
39 (19:19:46) Bill Stevens, a LaCresta Drive resident, was concerned about the increase in
40 commercial development. He believed a precedent was set with the development on the UDOT
41 strip currently under construction. It will be a two-story building that will block the view and
42 will increase traffic on 2000 East. He was concerned that more retail development and more
43 traffic will be brought to the Highland area. Chair Nicholl clarified that the matter remains
44 undecided. Mr. Stevens reiterated that he does not want such development in the area. Chair
45 Nicholl added that the matter could be further addressed during the pertinent agenda item.

1 There were no further public comments. Chair Nicholl closed the public hearing.

2
3 Commissioner Rosevear suggested the item be scheduled for a decision. Mr. Black commented
4 that with regard to signage restrictions, he thought it would be better to make stricter signage
5 requirements for mixed-use self-storage. He explained that the City does not have specific
6 requirements for office buildings that are different than retail buildings. He added that a draft of
7 the requirements would be delivered to the Commission prior to it being scheduled for a
8 decision. Commissioner Rosevear commented that it would be a conditional use. Mr. Black
9 stated that a conditional use building could be proposed without signage. The signage could be
10 approved separately as a permitted use. Mr. Black stated that the signage regulations could be
11 completed within 30 days, or sooner if necessary. Chair Nicholl asked that the item be added to
12 the next meeting's agenda.

13
14 **3.2 The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing and receive comments on the**
15 **proposed amendments to the Foothill Recreational Zone F-20; Foothill Residential**
16 **Zone F-1-43; Foothill Residential Zone F-1-21; Rural Residential Zone RR-1-43;**
17 **Rural Residential Zone RR-1-21; Residential Single Family Zone R-1-15;**
18 **Residential Single Family Zone R-1-10; Residential Single Family Zone R-1-8;**
19 **Residential Single Family Zone R-1-6 zoning amendment. Modifying setbacks for**
20 **accessory structures and reevaluating the adopted list of permitted and conditional**
21 **uses.**
22

23 (19:22:48) Mr. Black presented the staff report and clarified that the item is a City-initiated
24 amendment. Uses are being removed from zones that are considered inconsistent or outdated.
25 Zones range from F-20, a 20-acre lot size down to R-1-6, which has a 6,000-square foot lot size
26 designation. All conditional and permitted uses are being considered for these zones. For
27 example, churches are listed as conditional uses in some zones but not in others. To address this
28 inconsistency, churches were added to other residential zones. Some zones allowed home
29 occupations as permitted uses while home daycare was listed as a conditional use. Therefore, all
30 daycares were changed to conditional uses. He explained that the changes are available for the
31 public to view. He noted that this is the second public hearing on the matter.

32
33 Chair Nicholl explained that the City was concerned with many of the permitted and conditional
34 uses in residential zones. As a result they were cleaned up to address various inconsistencies.
35 He stated that if there is a conditional use for which the Commission cannot find a compelling
36 argument to disallow, the use must be allowed.

37
38 Chair Nicholl opened the public hearing.

39
40 (19:25:53) An unidentified citizen inquired as to the location of the properties. Chair Nicholl
41 explained that the properties are located throughout the City. The citizen thought the location
42 would make a big difference as to how he feels about it. Mr. Black explained that every
43 residential property in the City would be affected. Approximately 60% of all residential
44 properties in the City are zoned R-1-8. Mr. Black read the changes to the R-1-8 zone for the
45 benefit of the public. He explained that the intent is to protect the character of the neighborhood
46 for the residents.

1
2 Chair Nicholl thought the citizen was confusing the last item discussed with this one. For
3 clarification, a zoning map was displayed. Commissioner Frost explained that the ordinances are
4 being made to be more consistent throughout the City. The citizen understood; however, he did
5 not understand where the particular properties are located.

6
7 (19:29:09) Mr. Black explained that the yellow area on the map displayed represents the R-1-8
8 zone. R-1-8 is a residential single-family zoning designation with a minimum lot size of 8,000
9 square feet, which is a lot measuring approximately 70 feet by 110 feet. It is a designation
10 covering most residential lots in the City. The proposed changes to the zone involve primarily a
11 change to the permitted uses. Today the only permitted uses are things that a property owner has
12 the right at any time to build. They include single-family dwellings and accessory buildings that
13 are customary to single-family dwellings, such as a shed or garage. The other permitted use is
14 home occupations. It includes such things as a home office, a hair salon, or a daycare. The
15 proposal would make home occupations conditional uses rather than permitted uses in the future.
16 To pursue a conditional use, an applicant must come to the City and request approval of the use.

17
18 Commissioner Haymore explained that conditions of approval protect against negative impacts
19 to the neighbors. The needs of the individual applicant are balanced against those of the
20 surrounding neighbors. Mr. Black further explained that it helps the neighbors by mitigating
21 potential detrimental effects that come about because of the use. In cases of conditional uses, the
22 applicant must present a proposal to the Planning Commission, and the public has the
23 opportunity to comment on such an application.

24
25 Conditional uses in the R-1-8 zone include churches. One proposed change is to add private and
26 non-profit recreational grounds associated with churches. This would mean that a church in the
27 neighborhood could contain facilities such as a ball field or picnic area. Bed and breakfast
28 facilities are currently a conditional use. Staff proposed removing them from the R-1-8 zone.
29 Another proposed change was to clarify that a home daycare/preschool is a home occupation.
30 They are currently listed separately. The amendments would list the two together for
31 consistency. A Planned Use Development (PUD), which is a residential development with
32 private streets, was listed as a conditional use that will remain according to the recommendation.
33 Private parks and recreational grounds are currently listed separately. Mr. Black explained that
34 this use would be moved to churches although a private non-profit recreational ground could also
35 be allowed that is unrelated to a church, such as a park that is part of a homeowners' association.

36
37 (19:33:24) Public and quasi-public uses such as libraries and pumping stations for water will
38 remain. Radio and television towers are proposed to be completely removed from the zone.
39 Temporary structures are proposed to be removed as they are covered in another chapter.
40 Mr. Black explained that temporary structures are buildings such as construction offices. Water
41 pumping plants and reservoirs are also proposed to be removed, because it is redundant to say
42 that public and quasi-public uses are allowed.

43
44 Mr. Black commented that wireless telecommunication towers will remain. He explained that
45 there is a strict conditional use process for these items as they are now being considered utilities
46 as more residents move away from the use of landline telephones.

1
2 Utility stations and lines, as allowed by applicable accessory regulations from Chapter 19.76,
3 will be removed because of redundancy issues. This would fall under the public and quasi-
4 public use category. Public schools will be removed as well. Mr. Black explained that there is
5 no need for them to be included since if there was a true need for a school in the area, the zoning
6 ordinance would not be applicable. He stated that home occupations are a redundancy that will
7 also be removed.
8

9 (19:36:06) Mr. Black then presented a map of the all zonings in the City and described the color-
10 coding. He explained that all areas not shaded represent the R-1-8 zone. Chair Nicholl added
11 that the majority of the City is in the R-1-8 zone. He clarified that all residential zoning
12 designations have been reviewed and the permitted and conditional uses have been cleaned up,
13 with many items being removed. The Commission wanted to ensure that those items that would
14 not fit in the areas be removed before further development of the City. These changes have been
15 applied for all parcels from F-20, the largest zoning of 20-acre parcels, down to R-1-6, the
16 smallest zone in the City. The citizen apologized for his question, but stated that his question
17 was still not answered if they were discussing the storage unit facility. Chair Nicholl and other
18 Commission Members clarified that they are not currently discussing the storage unit facility.
19 The citizen further stated that he did not understand how a decision could be made if they are
20 unaware of the location of the property. Chair Nicholl clarified that no decision will be made at
21 the current meeting. The citizen stated that he still did not understand.
22

23 Chair Nicholl explained that there are several different zones in the City, including residential,
24 commercial, and mixed-use, which is a blend of between residential and commercial. The
25 Mixed-Use zone is where the self-storage center is being considered, although without a specific
26 location. Chair Nicholl suggested that the citizen visit the website to examine the zone map, or
27 obtain a map from the Planning Department. Mr. Black explained that if the self-storage facility
28 does come to fruition and there is a proposed site, the application will appear before the
29 Commission again for specific site approval. Chair Nicholl explained that this would give the
30 citizen a chance to discuss the issue at that time. He added that at this time, the Commission is
31 merely deciding whether this type of use would be desirable within the Mixed-Use zone. If this
32 is allowed, then the applicants will have to return with the specific location and design of the
33 building and citizens will be able to comment on the proposal.
34

35 (19:41:33) There were no further public comments. Chair Nicholl closed the public hearing and
36 explained that the Commission will discuss this item in the action item section of the agenda.
37

38 **3.3 The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing and receive comments on the**
39 **land use map of the general plan for properties located on the west side of Highland**
40 **Drive between 1989 East Meadow Drive and 6876 South Highland Drive.**
41

42 (19:41:50) Chair Nicholl explained that this item is a public hearing issue and no decision would
43 be made tonight. City Planner, Greg Platt, presented the staff report and explained that the
44 Planning Department is in the process of a public scoping of the issue. They are seeking public
45 opinion as to whether or not such a change should be considered. The Planning Commission
46 will not be asked to decide this issue in the very near future. He further explained that an

1 applicant had originally requested a change to the General Plan in the area and the request was
2 brought to the Planning Commission at that time. The Commission decided that the entire area
3 needed to be considered and reviewed. Therefore, public opinion was now being sought. Other
4 stages such as data collection and traffic studies will be the next step in the process.

5
6 (19:45:01) Mr. Platt displayed a map showing the location of the subject properties. He
7 explained that most of the properties are currently residential homes, with the exception of a
8 dentist office, a church with parking lot, and a care center. He explained that staff has taken only
9 a cursory look at the property and is considering what changes, if any, should be made. Staff
10 considered medium-density residential, residential office, or neighborhood commercial land use
11 designations in the area. These have limited commercial potential, such as the existing dental
12 office. He reiterated that they are now seeking public comment to determine what the public
13 believes would be the best fit for the property. Mr. Black added that they would continue with
14 studies if public opinion warrants a change in the area. City Engineer, Brad Gilson, was present
15 to hear comments regarding traffic issues.

16
17 (19:47:49) Chair Nicholl stated that the property is located in the Gateway Zone and, therefore,
18 is of great concern to the Planning Commission. If any changes are made to the property, the
19 changes will be made properly and with a great deal of thought and care. He reiterated that it is
20 unknown whether a change would in fact be made. The Planning Commission will not act on the
21 applicant's proposal before extensive input. The item was discussed in the work session, and
22 many options were considered at that time. He also explained that the Planning Commission is a
23 recommending body and they do not make a permanent decision. The City Council will work
24 through the process as well.

25
26 Mr. Black explained that the issue has been changed to a broader dynamic view as a City-
27 initiated issue. For that reason no applicant was present to make a proposal at the meeting.

28
29 Chair Nicholl opened the public hearing.

30
31 (19:49:52) Joyce Felt gave her address 7156 South Willow Circle and explained that she spoke at
32 the previous meeting regarding this issue and will not duplicate her comments. She stated that
33 she and her husband recently purchased property immediately to the south of the dental office.
34 They would also like to construct a dental office at that location. She explained this would be a
35 small office, as her husband has a small practice downtown that they would like to relocate. She
36 is in favor of amending the General Plan to Neighborhood Commercial. She feels this is a
37 transitional area that is not as largely commercial as other zones. She obtained traffic counts
38 from UDOT, which she made available to the Commission. According to this data, between I-
39 215 and 7000 South, there were 51,190 cars in the location in 2006. Further south, traffic counts
40 reduce to 36,375. On Interstate 215, there are 85,390 cars. North of I-215, between I-215 and
41 6200 South, there are 51,010 cars. As this becomes the expressway, traffic reduces to 37,700
42 cars. On 7000 South, between 1300 East to Highland Drive, there are 27,320 cars.

43
44 (19:52:42) Mrs. Felt stated that this data shows that Highland Drive has almost double the traffic
45 of Fort Union. This is also a major interchange for the valley at this location. She researched the
46 subject properties for ownership and current use. Chair Nicholl explained to Mrs. Felt at this

1 time that public comments are limited to three minutes and apologized for not clarifying this.
2 Mrs. Felt continued to explain that 50 percent of the properties in the area are uses other than
3 single-family uses under the same ownership. Seven single-family homes are owned by the
4 same owner, four properties are vacant or in disrepair, including the property she and her
5 husband purchased. Three parcels are owned by the church, one of which was the elder care
6 facility that is now vacant. There is also a preschool in the area and three single-family homes
7 under different ownership that are investment properties. This indicates a ratio of 58% of the
8 properties that are other than single-family homes. She then explained that the County has told
9 her that an 80% reduction in tax revenues is given to those properties.

10
11 (19:54:39) Mrs. Felt believed that the property and the entire area is in transition to commercial.
12 She observed from her children attending the preschool that most traffic through the frontage
13 road returns to Highland Drive to I-215 or Fort Union and not onto LaCresta.

14
15 (19:55:49) Eric Felt gave his address as 7956 South Willow Circle and explained that he is the
16 husband of the previous speaker. He stated that this is a gateway property, and he believes the
17 most attractive property in the area is the dental office. He believes that the ideal situation for
18 the area would be new buildings that will buffer the residential neighborhood.

19
20 (19:56:41) Jack Serstins gave his address as 6814 South Highland Drive, which is one of the
21 subject properties. He stated that his biggest concern is that the property cannot be resold to a
22 family as a residence due to its proximity to the busy street. He believes that the properties will
23 become commercial eventually and property values will increase as a result.

24
25 (19:57:34) Jennifer Nielson gave her address as LaCresta Drive and inquired whether the
26 frontage road will remain or if it will eventually open up to Highland Drive. Chair Nicholl
27 explained that that was not known. Mrs. Nielson stated that she is concerned about the traffic
28 that uses LaCresta as a route from Highland to Fort Union. Chair Nicholl stated that this is a
29 major concern of the Commission as well.

30
31 (19:58:23) Steve Sharp stated that he would like a unified mix in the area rather than changing
32 the development in a piecemeal fashion. This is happening slowly and all the properties will
33 eventually become commercial. People cannot sell the properties in the area for residential use.
34 He added that his property has a variance. However, others are accepting lower sale prices than
35 other houses in the subdivision. Mr. Sharp stated that his property has been broken into several
36 times in the past five years and there had also been problems with homeless people in front
37 yards. His house is currently unoccupied, which is a further problem. He does not want to rent it
38 and it cannot be sold for an adequate price. He believes many people in the area would benefit
39 from the zone change.

40
41 (20:01:09) Mike Evans gave his address as 6671 South Village Road, which is located behind the
42 preschool in the subject area. He stated that a correction to the traffic data given by an earlier
43 speaker would be 2000 East, not Highland Drive. Chair Nicholl agreed that this would be 2000
44 East and clarified that further traffic studies would be done. Mr. Evans explained that he works
45 for UDOT and lives in the area. The issue is not only people that drive through the
46 neighborhood between Highland and Fort Union, but also those that come from I-215 and drive

1 over the curb and gutter, continuing through the neighborhood down Greenfield. He added that
2 when the preschool is in session, motorists cannot access the neighborhood that is blocked by the
3 preschool customers. Other members of the public agreed. Mr. Evans stated that this is a daily
4 occurrence. Chair Nicholl explained that this is of major concern of the Commission.

5
6 Commissioner Rosevear commented that the question before the public and the Commission at
7 this meeting is whether what is proposed should even be considered. She explained that one of
8 the options would be road closures to control traffic in the area. If traffic is the problem, the
9 issue can be addressed. Mr. Evans commented that one option would be to forbid a right-hand
10 turn on a red light at LaCresta. Commissioner Rosevear inquired whether a one-way street
11 would solve this problem. Mr. Evans stated this is a major exit from the neighborhood. The
12 traffic issues would need to be studied. He suggested a six-foot wall be built as a barrier
13 between Highland Drive and the residential properties in the area. Chair Nicholl explained that
14 this would be one possible solution. Commissioner Rosevear stated that this would need to be
15 studied in order to be considered as a viable option. She inquired as to whether such a study
16 should occur. Chair Nicholl reiterated that traffic is an issue the Commission is very concerned
17 about and will closely examine.

18
19 Mr. Evans further stated that another issue would be that if commercial development does occur,
20 it will reduce the value of those lots behind such buildings.

21
22 (20:05:25) Heather Stevens gave her address as LaCresta and stated that she was present at a
23 previous Commission Meeting where there was discussion of the building under construction in
24 the area. She was told she would receive an email regarding the next meeting for discussion of
25 that building; however, she never received the email. There was to be a traffic meter in the area
26 as well, which was never installed. Ms. Stevens believes the traffic has doubled since the 2006
27 statistical data due to apartment buildings and duplexes built in the area. Her taxes have
28 increased \$800 in the past year, and she is concerned about a further increase due to commercial
29 development. She stated that she is confused about whether the Commission is considered the
30 City Council or if there is another body. Chair Nicholl explained that the Planning Commission
31 is different than the City Council. The Council consists of the Mayor and other elected officials.
32 Commission Members are appointed. He explained that City Council Meetings are held in the
33 same venue as the Planning Commission on Tuesdays.

34
35 Ms. Stevens inquired as to whether any of the Commission Members live in the area.
36 Commissioner Frost explained that there was a Commission Member from the area who recently
37 left the Commission. Ms. Stevens believed that more businesses add more traffic and reduce the
38 property values for residential buildings. She reiterated that her concerns are traffic, taxes, and
39 lack of a traffic meter for the current development.

40
41 (20:08:31) Danette Kennelly a 37-year resident, prepared the following written statement:

42
43 “Cottonwood Heights was supposed to become its own City so that local residents would have
44 more control over things that happen in our community. I am a resident. I would like some
45 control over my community. Home ownership is one of the largest financial commitments most
46 families make. People purchase their homes for a number of reasons: Lifestyle, appeal of

1 surrounding community, and location, location, location. This change of zoning will affect
2 lifestyle, property values, and traffic congestion, to name a few, of the long-term problems this
3 will create. If you haven't been in the neighborhood, I suggest you drive through it. They will
4 funnel through on the road that comes off 7000 South down through LaCresta and make a
5 gigantic circle. They do it now after they leave the health food store, Great Harvest, and others.
6 It's already happening before we have any more commercial development. Zoning was created
7 to address these issues at the time the area is developed to assure the buyer that there will be a
8 known factor as to how the area would be managed, so the buyer could make an informed
9 decision before buying, so you knew what to expect in the future. If the motivation for the
10 proposed zone change is the collection of money from a tax base collected from businesses, let
11 me point out that there has been plenty of development of commercial property. Many of these
12 spaces are currently available. For example, redevelopment across Highland Drive, directly
13 north of LaCresta by the bank, new units on the rest of 23rd and 70th, space available in the
14 shopping center on the corner of 7000 and 23rd in the Rite Aid parking lot, space available in the
15 new shopping center built on 7000 north of Home Depot, new center being built near tracks on
16 7000 South, shopping area built on Highland at the bottom of a hill south of 7000. If your job is
17 to be my representative, I would like to be represented by you, recommending no zone change.
18 Keep it residential as zoned. And may I end with a suggestion? In the future, rather than making
19 choices based on the motivation of more, more, more, maybe the motivation should be enough.”
20

21 (20:10:59) Molly Sparks gave her address as 6801 South Greendale Road and explained that she
22 just made an investment to upgrade the neighborhood. She believes the property values will
23 plummet as a result of the proposed change. She questioned whether Cottonwood Heights is
24 envisioned as a commercial environment or a place to raise children. Ms. Sparks believes that
25 the tax base trumps the quality of life for City residents, which will deteriorate as a result of
26 commercial build-out. She believes crime will increase, while residential and commercial values
27 will decrease. She is concerned that the build-out will cause a strain on police, fire, and
28 infrastructure expenses. The destruction of the value for residents outweighs the tax base benefit
29 to the City for this small area.
30

31 (20:12:56) Shane Beckman gave his address as 6705 Village Road and commented that while he
32 understands the position of those in favor of this change, he disagrees with some of the
33 statements. He feels the assumption that the change will happen eventually devalues the opinion
34 of the residents. Mr. Beckman also disagrees with the statement that the majority on Highland
35 Drive want the change and in fact, he believes the majority of the residents do not want the
36 zoning change. He is concerned with the traffic in the area speeding and running stop signs, and
37 believes that more businesses will compound the problem. He strongly encouraged the
38 Commission to explore the opinion of the majority, which would be to not move forward with
39 the zoning change.
40

41 (20:14:27) Ella Glassett gave her address as 6632 Highland Drive and stated that this is her first
42 appearance before the Commission. She lives on the corner of the subject area and agrees that
43 traffic comes from the freeway and travels down her street every day. She also agrees that a
44 family with children would not live in the homes. She believes a wall would create a more
45 residential feel. She further stated that the traffic nearly enters her yard at times. Chair Nicholl
46 reiterated that the Commission is aware of and very concerned about the traffic problems.

1
2 (20:15:36) Debbie Clark gave her address as 6635 Village Road and stated that it is a resale
3 problem. She agrees that the wall would help the resale value of the homes.
4

5 (20:15:57) Phil Brindle gave his address as 6690 Village Road and agreed with the previous
6 speaker regarding the wall. He added that he is unclear why the change is being proposed and
7 stated that he wishes to keep the neighborhood intact. A wall would be an option in the gateway
8 area, which could include some type of welcome message. He would like the area to remain
9 residential.
10

11 (20:16:39) Scott Nelson gave his address as 1969 Meadow Drive and commented how the City is
12 doing well to protect mountain view property from commercial encroachment, and thanked them
13 for their efforts. He was unsure why the west side of the neighborhood is well protected from
14 commercial encroachment, while the east side may face such development with this proposed
15 change.
16

17 (20:17:08) Marie Kennelly stated that when residents purchased their properties in this area, they
18 did not want more commercial development and there are ample commercial buildings. She
19 believes the dentist office is enough commercial development in the neighborhood.
20

21 (20:17:43) Sherri Detmeller gave her address as 6705 Village Road, right behind the subject
22 property. She owns two lots and has lived there for over 30 years, and maintains her house and
23 property. She does not want buildings in her backyard overlooking her yard and house. She
24 does not want the change.
25

26 (20:18:23) (name inaudible) gave her address as 6641 Village Road and commented that if a
27 dentist office would be put in her backyard, they would remove their deck because it would
28 render their backyard unusable. She would like to keep the area residential.
29

30 (20:18:57) An unidentified citizen explained that she owns three properties in the area at 1979,
31 1981, and 6746 Highland Drive. She stated that she does not want a wall on the street. She
32 believes the view is already blocked. She inquired whether the residents of Highland Drive will
33 be given a voice in whether a wall is constructed or not. Chair Nicholl explained that a wall is
34 not being discussed at this time and options are simply being explored. The citizen further asked
35 that should the option present itself, what input residents would have. Chair Nicholl answered
36 that there will be multiple meetings on the issue. Commissioner Haymore inquired as to whether
37 the citizen is living on the property. She confirmed that she is and that one property belongs to
38 her father.
39

40 (20:20:16) Christy Lewis did not give her address, but reported that her parent's house is directly
41 behind the daycare facility. She explained that they had to install a brick wall because of the
42 noise, which affected the view. The family has been in the house for 50 years. She explained
43 that it is a privacy issue and no more of this type of development is needed in the area.
44

45 (20:20:53) Darin Nielson gave his address as 1972 East LaCresta and commented that while the
46 homes are old, he takes pride in his home and maintains his yard. There are new homes under

1 construction that will encourage growth in the neighborhood. He believes that property values
2 have increased and will continue to do so, but he does not want the commercial use atmosphere.
3 He would prefer to see homes rebuilt in the area than commercial development, as there are
4 some unsightly, unkempt homes in the neighborhood. He appreciates that the dental office was
5 attractively designed. However, he would like it to remain a residential area. He added that he is
6 also concerned about traffic.

7
8 (20:22:51) An unidentified citizen commented that at the time of the dental office construction,
9 the zoning was single-family residences only. The office was constructed with a conditional use
10 permit. He added that it violates the frontage requirements on Highland Drive and LaCresta
11 because it is a three-story building, which was not approved with the conditional use. The home
12 next door belongs to his son, and his view is obstructed. He commented that although this
13 building is an infraction of the rules, it remains. Part of the problem is that this sets a precedent
14 for other builders in the area.

15
16 There were no further public comments. Chair Nicholl stated that the public hearing will remain
17 open and emails and phone calls to the Planning Department were welcomed. He remarked that
18 the City will be directed to obtain traffic studies and many options will be considered.

19
20 (08:25:02) Commissioner Haymore asked Mr. Black for the email address to which the public
21 should send comments. Mr. Platt suggested comments sent directly to him via email at
22 gplatt@cottonwoodheights.utah.gov. Business cards were made available to the public for the
23 mailing address. Mr. Black asked for clarification of the length of the public comment period.
24 Chair Nicholl stated that this item would remain open for comment for two weeks.

25
26 Commissioner Rosevear appreciated the time the public took to gather information for the
27 Commission. She appreciated both points of view in the matter, and realizes property values will
28 be affected. She further stated that something needs to be done about the traffic in the area, and
29 that a wall is a possibility. The height of commercial buildings needs to be considered as
30 compared with the residential in the area, as those buildings will have a view of the neighbors.
31 The noise issues also need to be addressed. She reiterated that she appreciates the comment and
32 the work done by the public. She supported keeping the item open as more research needs to be
33 done.

34
35 (20:27:32) Commissioner Frost was grateful to see citizens take an interest in the community and
36 remarked that this is the exception, not the norm. She appreciated the opportunity to
37 representing people who have a concern in the community and are responsive.

38
39 (20:28:10) Commissioner Bolyard stated that there are issues that need to be dealt with in this
40 area, such as homes that are not being maintained. There is no incentive for the owners to fix the
41 homes because they cannot be sold as single-family residences. If there was a change to
42 commercial, these properties could be sold. He further commented that incentives should be
43 considered for owner-occupant rehabilitation of existing homes, or construction of new homes.
44 He believes the wall would abate some noise and help with traffic issues. Chair Nicholl added
45 that traffic control can be discussed. However, incentives for owner occupants would fall under

1 the jurisdiction of the State Commission. Commissioner Bolyard agreed and added that
2 something needs to be done to help the neighborhood.

3
4 (20:29:46) Commissioner Haymore commented that residents buy their homes with the idea to
5 put down roots and raise their children, and want assurances of the future of the area. As time
6 passes, those dreams are changed. These changes are considered individually. However, with a
7 General Plan amendment, this changes the core of the issues. He does not believe it should be
8 considered lightly or brought to the table on a regular basis. For him, this item raised the issue of
9 a more predictable, deliberate approach to dealing with General Plan amendments on a regular
10 basis, so that neighbors do not have to fear that these changes could happen at any time. He
11 believes that this should be brought up on only an annual basis. Staff could present good studies
12 with which to decide such issues. Commissioner Haymore believes that this opportunity should
13 be used to refine the kinds of questions that require quantitative data to answer and perhaps the
14 frequency with which the General Plan is reconsidered should be made clear. While there may
15 be times when the General Plan needs to be changed, it should happen with order and regularity
16 when appropriate. He suggested setting a timetable for General Plan review. The City should
17 decide that the General Plan needs to be addressed, not a citizen who wants to build a specific
18 development. He believes comments made at this meeting could be addressed in advance if the
19 change were handled in an organized format. For example, there may be an area that is in need
20 of redevelopment funds in order to avoid a blight problem. He would like a proactive general
21 review of the General Plan which is deliberate and scheduled, where predictable questions are
22 already answered.

23
24 (20:34:50) Commissioner Keane agreed with Commissioner Haymore. While undecided on this
25 particular issue, he stated that he is leaning toward disapproving it because the Master Plan
26 affects the entire City. He was uncomfortable amending it one section at the time. He believed
27 it should be a deliberate review, either annually or every two years, where the entire Master Plan
28 is reviewed with consideration for the City as a whole. Chair Nicholl stated that he supports this
29 suggestion. He added that there is an issue before the Commission that must be addressed. He
30 believes that if there is a schedule set for addressing the General Plan, the Commission can plan
31 toward such a meeting so that all information is before the Commission and an informed
32 decision can be made. Commissioner Keane agreed.

33
34 (20:36:26) Commissioner Rosevear inquired as to whether such a General Plan review schedule
35 is permitted. Mr. Black stated that this can be done, and added that normally these are not done
36 more than twice a year, excepting the current year. A date can be set so that people can apply in
37 advance to be considered on the agenda. Chair Nicholl stated that this should be considered for
38 the next two weeks and be readdressed at the next meeting. The Commission operates on fact
39 and not emotion, and so the additional time to consider this option should be utilized by the
40 Commission. In answer to Mr. Black for clarification, Chair Nicholl stated that the possible
41 calendar for General Plan review would be discussed at the next meeting. Mr. Black explained
42 that in 30 days, staff could give an update to the Commission on discoveries and public comment
43 on the agenda item. Chair Nicholl clarified that a decision would not be made in two weeks, but
44 would be considered for quite some time.

(20:38:19) In answer to some citizens, Mr. Black explained that they could sign up on the City's website to receive future Planning Commission agendas. Those without a computer could read postings in the newspapers or visit the Whitmore Library, the Cottonwood Heights Recreational Center, or City Hall to read the agendas. In addition, the City Hall will provide them with the most current agenda at any time. There is also an information line given as 944-7000. Newspapers are faxed the agenda on the Friday preceding the meeting. Chair Nicholl assured the citizens that they will be informed of the agenda.

A citizen stated that she does not receive mail delivery at her home and would need to obtain agenda information another way. Chair Nicholl explained that the Planning Commission has no control over the postal service delivery. Mr. Platt then clarified that the information line given, 944-7000, is not the information line for the newspaper, but for the City. This number will reach the front desk of the City, which will transfer you to the hotline. Commissioner Haymore explained that the Planning Commission meets on the first and third Wednesdays of every month at 7:00 p.m. Chair Nicholl thanked the citizens for their participation.

4. ACTION ITEMS.

4.1 The Planning Commission will take action on the proposed amendments to the Foothill Recreation Zone F-20; Foothill Residential Zone F-1-43; Foothill Residential Zone F-1-21; Rural Residential Zone RR-1-43; Rural Residential Zone RR-1-21; Residential Single Family Zone R-1-15; Residential Single Family Zone R-1-10; Residential Single Family Zone R-1-8; Residential Single Family Zone R-1-6 zoning amendment. Amendments include modifying setbacks for accessory structures and modifying the adopted list of permitted and conditional uses.

(20:43:43) Mr. Black explained that this item is the same as that in item 3.2, for which a public hearing was held earlier in the meeting. Staff recommended approval of the amendments and asked for the Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council. Chair Nicholl turned the item over for discussion by the Commission.

(20:44:00) *Commissioner Haymore moved that the proposed amendments listed in item 4.1 be approved. Commissioner Armstrong seconded the motion.*

Commissioner Haymore stated that there has been adequate discussion and consideration of the issues. While there are some issues that he does not favor, he believes it is the best compromise and he is ready to support the drafted language.

(20:44:47) *Vote on motion: Amy Rosevear-Aye; Doug Haymore-Aye; Geoff Armstrong-Aye; JoAnn Frost-Aye; Perry Bolyard-Aye; Jim Keane-Aye; Gordon Nicholl-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*

4.2 The Planning Commission will take action on the proposed amendments to Chapter 19.76, Supplementary and Qualifying Regulations.

(20:44:57) Mr. Black explained that multiple public hearings have been held on this item, as well as discussion during the work session. Staff recommended approval of the current draft.

1 Mr. Black pointed out that there are still some blanks in the draft. There is still an issue
2 regarding required distances from septic tanks. He believes this is a Health Department issue
3 that they are still investigating. He clarified that this will be finished before the draft goes before
4 the City Council.

5
6 (20:45:08) *Commissioner Frost moved to recommend approval of item 4.2, the proposed*
7 *amendments to Chapter 19.76, Supplementary and Qualifying Regulations with the caveat*
8 *they look at estate fences. Commissioner Keane seconded the motion.*
9

10 Commissioner Rosevear inquired whether a conditional use for an estate fence should be added
11 before the item is sent to the City Council or if it should go forward as written. Mr. Black
12 explained that some cities list specific roads where a front fence can be built; however, he
13 believes it is more a function of the size of lot than road location and questioned how big the lot
14 would need to be before it is considered an estate. Commissioner Rosevear suggested this be
15 one acre. Commissioner Frost added that the zone is irrelevant, as some are in R-1-8 zones.
16 Commissioner Haymore commented that he believes the item should move forward, provided
17 the estate fence issue can be revisited. Mr. Black confirmed that it can. Commissioner Haymore
18 further suggested that the item move forward and an agenda item be scheduled to examine the
19 estate fence issue. He agreed that particular street location is not an issue, as infill may occur
20 where a homeowner buys multiple lots. Mr. Black confirmed that this has begun, where two
21 homes are bought and one is put in its place or where two homes are connected into one.
22 Commissioner Haymore added that this is happening in his neighborhood, where a buyer is
23 purchasing multiple lots to be replaced by larger homes on larger lots.

24
25 (20:48:38) Commissioner Frost suggested an exception to the motion regarding fencing, in
26 particular estate fencing, that it will be addressed at a later date. Chair Nicholl clarified that the
27 ordinance needs to go before the City Council and is a recommendation to the Council.
28 Commissioner Haymore suggested the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council
29 examine the estate fencing component.

30
31 (20:49:22) Chair Nicholl explained that the motion was amended to include the caveat that the
32 City Council examine the issue of estate fences.

33
34 (20:49:48) *Vote on motion: Amy Rosevear-Aye; Doug Haymore-Aye; Geoff Armstrong-Aye;*
35 *JoAnn Frost-Aye; Perry Bolyard-Aye; Jim Keane-Aye; Gordon Nicholl-Aye. The motion*
36 *passed unanimously.*
37

38 **4.3 The Planning Commission will take action on a request by Jason Adams for a**
39 **conditional use permit for the Avalon Point Subdivision. The applicant is**
40 **requesting a Planned Unit Development located at 8420 South Wasatch Blvd.**
41

42 (20:49:58) Mr. Platt explained that a public hearing was held on this item on August 20, 2008.
43 Issues relevant to the PUD include that with a PUD, the City is able to place conditions on it that
44 would not be available in a standard subdivision. Staff believes benefits to the City would be
45 beautification along Wasatch Boulevard, that there would be a requirement for landscaping the
46 City could enforce, that there is a trail system which would be open to the public, connecting the

1 City's property on Danish through the subdivision and out to Wasatch, that the City would have
2 design control of the buildings such as maximum height and consistency, and that open space
3 would be provided, slightly more than required by the City for a PUD. Staff recommended
4 approval, which includes a density increase up to no greater than 17 lots. Mr. Platt added that a
5 standard subdivision could likely include 11 lots on the property.

6
7 Chair Nicholl commented that the discussion could likely go beyond 9:00 p.m. for this item.
8 Commissioner Armstrong suggested a motion to extend the meeting time should this occur.

9
10 (20:53:25) ***Commissioner Haymore moved that the item be tabled and the applicant given an***
11 ***opportunity to come forward with a lot density of less than 17. If they do not do so within two***
12 ***weeks, the current proposed PUD will be denied. Commissioners Rosevear seconded the***
13 ***motion.***

14
15 Commissioner Haymore explained that pursuant to the ordinance Chapter 19.78.020, Planned
16 Unit Developments going to the highest density allowed under the PUD ordinance are available
17 "only in the most meritorious situations in order to induce or reward efforts to achieve the
18 highest levels of positive contribution under the design, open space, and other community
19 enhancement aspects of this Chapter." Commissioner Haymore added that it is not his personal
20 opinion that the PUD as proposed meets that standard. He believes the surrounding community
21 is similar to R-1-10, about 10,000-square foot lots, and that is what is consistent in the area. He
22 commented that there are meritorious aspects of the design plan, including the beautification of
23 Wasatch and the open space trail. However, this proposal includes nearly a 50% density
24 increase, which is significant. He does not believe that public walkways in front of the lots have
25 been presented in this proposal. There are negative effects to the surrounding community that
26 Commissioner Haymore does not believe have been or can be mitigated at the proposed density.
27 He believes these effects could be mitigated with fewer units and the number of units currently
28 available is more consistent with the surrounding community. He summarized that the PUD as
29 proposed does not meet the standards of the PUD statute and does not adequately mitigate
30 negative results on the surrounding community. He believes a 10% to 20 % upgrade in density
31 would be more consistent with the community. Commissioners Rosevear and Frost concurred.
32 Commissioner Keane agreed and stated that he also opposes the 17 units and would have to see a
33 lower proposal.

34
35 (20:58:14) Commissioner Haymore clarified that the reason he wanted a plan in this instance is
36 that this item is different. In other instances before the Commission at this meeting, they have
37 been asked to look at zone issues, which is not a specific project such as this item. The planning
38 and zoning structure gives the opportunity to look at such plans in this instance. He believes
39 actually seeing the plan is appropriate in this case. Chair Nicholl thanked Commissioner
40 Haymore for addressing the issue.

41
42 Mr. Black stated that the applicant was indicating to him that he would like to address the
43 Commission, and inquired whether the Commission would allow such a comment. Chair
44 Nicholl explained that he does not want to open the issue to a lengthy public discussion, but
45 would allow the applicant to address the Commission for a period of three minutes.

1 (21:00:14) The applicant, Jason Adams, explained that they have attempted to incorporate
2 comments from the last meeting to make the development more consistent with the zone. The
3 surrounding zone is R-1-8, and setbacks have been adjusted along all perimeter properties to be
4 consistent with the zone. Therefore, the neighbors will be afforded the exact setback that would
5 occur in a standard subdivision. The PUD will give a smaller home visibility from neighboring
6 homes. The reduction of lots will not reduce the number of homes they can see from their
7 backyard. Each yard lines up with one house. Commissioner Haymore asked for clarification,
8 as it appears that this is not the case on the corner. Mr. Adams agreed that in one instance this is
9 correct. He added that they have increased the amount of trees that will be planted along the
10 perimeter, which would make a better view for the neighbors than a standard subdivision. A
11 standard subdivision would allow for a larger, taller house, located closer to the access street.
12 The amount of parking space for the homes was increased per the recommendation of the
13 Architectural Review Committee to reduce sidewalk obstructions. The planned houses are more
14 conservative-looking, with better access.

15
16 Mr. Adams explained that the other public benefit is the trail system. There is currently no
17 access between Danish Road and Wasatch Boulevard, and he believes this will be well-utilized
18 by the neighbors. The open space is open and green with no pavement, and the entire
19 community can enjoy the trail. Benches and trees will be added along Wasatch Boulevard.

20
21 (21:03:44) Chair Nicholl explained that action will be delayed for two weeks and requested that
22 the applicant send a summation of his comments to Mr. Black, who will forward them to the
23 Commission Members for review. Mr. Adams added that it is difficult to assess the detriment to
24 the community expressed by the Commission without specifics. Chair Nicholl instructed the
25 Planning Commission to send written concerns to Mr. Black within a week. Commissioner
26 Rosevear stated that this was included in the motion. Commissioner Haymore stated that there
27 are procedural issues for handling these types of issues outside of an open meeting. Chair
28 Nicholl clarified that they will be handled at an open meeting in two weeks. Commissioner
29 Haymore clarified that his motion would not bring the issue back unless there is a new
30 application that reduces the number of units from 17 to a lower density. If an application is not
31 received, the motion includes a denial. Commissioner Rosevear confirmed that that was her
32 understanding in seconding the motion.

33
34 Mr. Black commented that Commissioner Haymore identified a detrimental effect that is
35 insufficiently mitigated, which is the reason for denial unless the plan is changed to fewer units.
36 Otherwise, the item would not come back before the Commission. Mr. Adams stated that he is
37 unclear what the detrimental effect is. Commissioner Haymore clarified that he believes the
38 density is higher than the surrounding community to the point that it does not meet the standard
39 for that much extra density, pursuant to the statute. He added that it does not provide for
40 mitigation to the surrounding neighbors. Seventeen units is a significant number packed into a
41 tight space. He did not believe that was consistent with the surrounding community and it will
42 change that community in a way that has not been addressed. He believed the only way to
43 address the concern is with fewer units.

1 (21:06:48) Commissioner Frost agreed that the intent to change the dynamics of the
2 neighborhood is of concern, and the density numbers are an issue. She believed the mitigated
3 trade-off does not outweigh the intensity connected to the surrounding neighborhood.
4

5 (21:07:19) *Vote on motion: Amy Rosevear-Aye; Doug Haymore-Aye; Geoff Armstrong-Aye;*
6 *JoAnn Frost-Aye; Perry Bolyard-Aye; Jim Keane-Aye; Gordon Nicholl- Abstained. The*
7 *motion passed unanimously with one abstention.*
8

9 **5. DISCUSSION ITEMS.**

10 **5.1 There are no discussion items on the agenda.**

11
12 **6. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT.**

13
14 There was no Planning Director's report.
15

16 **7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

17 **7.1 April 16, 2008**

18 **7.2 May 21, 2008**

19 **7.3 June 4, 2008**

20 **7.4 August 20, 2008**

21 **7.5 September 3, 2008**
22

23 (21:07:56) Commissioner Haymore stated that he saw no changes required for the minutes and
24 was in favor of approval. Commissioner Rosevear inquired as to whether blanks had been filled.
25 It was confirmed that they had not. Commissioner Rosevear stated that she would rather approve
26 them with blanks than try to determine who made the statements. Mr. Black explained that the
27 blanks would be changed to read, "a Commissioner said."
28

29 (21:08:28) *Commissioner Rosevear moved to approve minutes for April 16, 2008, May 21,*
30 *2008, June 4, 2008, August 20, 2008, and September 3, 2008, pursuant to the staff report and*
31 *with the following amendment: Wherever there is a blank in the minutes, this will be replaced*
32 *by, "a Commissioner." Commissioner Haymore seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Amy*
33 *Rosevear-Aye; Doug Haymore-Aye; Geoff Armstrong-Aye; JoAnn Frost-Aye; Perry Bolyard-*
34 *Aye; Jim Keane-Aye; Gordon Nicholl-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*
35

36 **8. ADJOURNMENT.**

37
38 (21:09:15) *Commissioner Rosevear moved to adjourn. Commissioner Bolyard seconded the*
39 *motion. Vote on motion: Amy Rosevear-Aye; Doug Haymore-Aye; Geoff Armstrong-Aye;*
40 *JoAnn Frost-Aye; Perry Bolyard-Aye; Jim Keane-Aye; Gordon Nicholl-Aye. The motion was*
41 *passed unanimously.*
42

43 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

1
2 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*
3 *Cottonwood Heights City Planning Commission meeting held Wednesday, September 17, 2008.*
4
5

6
7 
8
9

10 Teri Forbes
11 T Forbes Group
12 Minutes Secretary
13

14
15 Minutes approved:

DRAFT